

News from Hungary

Plan for the Publication of the Minutes of the Joint Ministerial Council of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

Historians of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy have long complained that only a handful of published source collections is available to the many scholars in all parts of the world who are actively pursuing research projects in the field. For almost three decades no single work as important as the eight-volume *Österreich-Ungarns Außenpolitik* has seen the light of day. The fact that none of the documents of the highest government offices have yet been published is especially to be regretted. The tremendous increase in interest in the history of the Danubian monarchy in Central Europe and elsewhere during the past decades gives proof that the number of published documents collections needs to be increased. Consequently, the Hungarian and Austrian historians have decided to publish the minutes of the joint council of ministers of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in serial form.

This large undertaking began as the project of an individual scholar. A Hungarian historian Miklós Komjátyi edited the first volume—*Protokolle des gemeinsamen Ministerrates der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie 1914-1918* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966)—with painstaking care. The series began “backwards” because those who planned the project were of the opinion that at the present time scholars are more interested in questions involving the First World War and the approaching crisis, the collapse of the monarchy, than in any other topic.

The publication of the above volume aroused such a favorable response among Austrian historians that they also became enthusiastic about participating in this large publication enterprise. Friedrich Engel-Janosi in particular proposed that the two groups work together and that the work should be published at an earlier date than had originally been planned. In 1967 Austrian and Hungarian historians began discussions over questions of principles and the methodological and technical problems involved in their publication. A definitive agreement was concluded in the summer of 1968.

It was agreed that Austrian and Hungarian historical com-

mittees specifically appointed for this purpose were jointly to assume responsibility for editing the minutes of the council of ministers of the Habsburg monarchy in two series. The first is to be devoted to the minutes of the years 1848-1867 and is to be edited and published by the Austrian committee. The preparation of the second series, which is to cover the period between 1867 and 1914, is to be mostly the responsibility of the Hungarian historians.

Uniform principles, methods, and technical forms will be followed in editing the publication. The two series will probably be published in twelve volumes brought out one by one during the course of the 1970's.

The most important points of the definitive agreement reached by the Austrian and Hungarian committees on June 17-18, 1968, in regard to precisely how this common publication undertaking is to be carried out are as follows:

1. It was agreed that both committees would cooperate in publishing a complete edition of *Die Ministerratsprotokolle Österreichs 1848-1867* (ser. 1) and *Die Ministerratsprotokolle der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie 1867-1918* (ser. 2).

2. The editing of the first series is to be assigned to the Austrian committee and that of the second to both the Hungarian and the Austrian committees. The work is to be divided in the following manner: The Hungarian committee is to compile and edit the minutes of the period between February 14, 1867 (Belcredi's resignation from office), and November, 1871 (the beginning of Andrassy's term of office), and between October, 1883 (after the signing of the agreement with Romania), and the end of the monarchy. The minutes of the period between these dates will be handled by the Austrian committee. Both committees believe that it is very important to bring out a second, enlarged edition of the volume dealing with the period between 1914 and 1918 that has already been published while the editorial work is still being done on the other volumes.

The names of the members of the editorial committee responsible for editing each volume are to be given on the fourth page.

3. A detailed statement about the editorial initiative undertaken by both committees and the cooperation between them in methods of procedure and contents is to be included in the preface of the first volume of the first series and of the first

volume of the second series. The other volumes are to contain a statement thanking the other committee for its cooperation. Each volume is to have an introduction dealing with both archival and historical matters.

4. The two committees are especially to cooperate with each other in adhering to the following procedures:

The committees deem it advisable to exchange manuscripts before they are printed and have set a two-month limit for their return. Each committee is entitled to make remarks presenting its own point of view about each manuscript. In order to preserve editorial consistency and to avoid unfriendly and annoying statements, the editorial committee is to pay serious attention to these remarks.

Both committees are to provide each other with mutual assistance and advice in all questions that may arise. Whenever it seems advisable they are also to consult with each other. There is to be at least one joint meeting of the two committees every year. These meetings are to be held alternately in Budapest and Vienna.

5. Editorial questions. Both committees have reached agreement on the following points and are of the opinion that the further clarification of details involving these points is to be reserved for further consultation:

a. The complete text of every available protocol is to be published.

b. Every variation in manuscript copy is to be taken into consideration.

c. Account is to be taken of all important drafts and variations in the drafts.

d. The importance of each enclosure is to be the determining factor in deciding whether or not it is to be published. This decision is to be made by the compiler, in case of doubt after consultation with the committee.

e. Annotations. Annotations about persons and places are to be made in the index.

f. Each volume is to contain an index of persons and an index of place names. In cases of frequent mention of a person, the entry is to be subdivided according to subject matter.

g. The text is to be standardized in a form suitable for current usage. The Austrian committee is to submit a detailed plan to serve as a working basis for this.

h. Unless a detailed agreement involving these matters is

made between both publishers, both committees are to insist on far-reaching uniformity in technical printing details (format, type, printing instructions, binding). The volume that has already been published is to serve as a model for the format.

*Historical Institute of the
Hungarian Academy of Sciences*

PÉTER HANÁK

*The Centennial Meeting of the
Hungarian Historical Society*

In the 1860's demands were voiced in various quarters for the formation of a national historical organization to serve as a vehicle to give fresh impetus to Hungarian historical writing. These desires were realized in 1867—the very year of the signing of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise—through the founding of the Hungarian Historical Society.

From the very beginning the Hungarian Historical Society has been a focal point for the widest circles of Hungarian historians. The Society and its periodical *Századok* have provided means and scope for research work and have served as an outlet for important publications and a vehicle for promoting the publication of source materials. The Society itself has published invaluable collections of source materials. In addition, it has supported historical studies by organizing lectures and arranging conferences. Its very existence, as well as the activities which it has promoted, has made it possible for Hungarian historians to participate in international meetings (mainly in Europe) and to become acquainted both with problems which recur periodically and with changes in methods and attitudes. On account of such exchanges of ideas on a European-wide scale, the writings of Austrian, German, French, and British historians have exerted a direct influence on Hungarian historical writing.

As a consequence of the cultural reforms made in 1949, the scope and activities of the Hungarian Historical Society underwent significant changes and its sphere of activities was considerably increased. True, the Society still continued its traditional functions of encouraging and assisting historians, arranging debates and lectures, and issuing serial publications. Since 1949 postgraduate teacher training, including instruction in the methods of teaching history, has, however, become

an increasingly important part of its work. The Society has arranged regular series of lectures and discussions and organized numerous meetings for the express purpose of bringing research scholars and history teachers together for common discussions on how problems involved in the teaching of history can be solved. It has inaugurated a new series devoted to historiography and has encouraged the publication of books of general interest which have become popular with a large circle of readers. In consequence of the changes in scope and direction after 1949, the Society has also stimulated research through offering prizes for works dealing with outstanding events in Hungarian history and has taken measures to encourage non-professional historians to write, and perhaps even publish, books.

The centennial meeting of the Society and the scientific program organized in conjunction with it were held in Budapest on August 22-25, 1967. Some of the sessions were devoted to topics relating to the hundred-year history of the Society; others dealt with professional and methodological questions. The opening session was devoted to a discussion of the most important tasks that were to be accomplished during the coming years. It was centered around a report which the secretary-general of the Society Iván T. Berend had especially prepared for this meeting. Then Győző Ember was elected president to fill the vacancy created by the death of Erik Molnár. It was decided to create an Erik Molnár memorial medal which is to be awarded in remembrance of the founding members and eminent past leaders of the Society.

The festive opening of the general assembly was followed by three days of special scientific meetings devoted to the history of the Hungarian Historical Society and to historiography and methodology. The newly-elected president of the Society Győző Ember presented a survey of the hundred-year history of the organization in which he placed particular emphasis on the interwar period. Other contributors to this part of the program discussed mainly the founding of the Society, the activities of its official journal *Századok*, and the books published by the Society. The editor of *Századok* Ervin Pamlényi analyzed the advances made in Hungarian historiography during the course of the past twenty years. He laid particular emphasis on the effects of the spread of Marxian Socialism on both content and methodology and pointed out

the difficulties and errors that stemmed from both dogmatism and revisionism. Other speakers tackled questions dealing with various branches of historical writing, including the peculiar problems involved in writing universal and military history and the history of labor movements. Lajos Elekes, corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, talked about the role of a knowledge of history in shaping human consciousness and developing a modern world concept. In addition, he discussed how socialist social conditions necessitated the finding of special solutions to particular problems.

Not only historians but also historians of literature and other scholars who need to keep abreast of the results of historical research joined the debate over various problems raised by the speakers. Perhaps because cultural history is still a field in which no special research and working methods meeting the requirements of modern methodology have found general acceptance, László Mátrai's paper on the methodological problems of this branch of history aroused an especially lively exchange of ideas. Mátrai emphasized the differences in interpretation between bourgeois and Marxist historians in regard to such problems as ideological history, the conception of ideas and their influence on various societies, and the relationship of ideas to the social structure and to class movements.

The presence of some forty guests from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Romania, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Great Britain, Austria, and the United States turned the centennial celebration of the Hungarian Historical Society into a truly international gathering. The United States was represented by Charles and Barbara Jelavich, Richard Burks, Peter Sugar, Ivo J. Lederer, Joseph F. Zacek, and Stephen Fischer-Galati. Many of the foreign guests participated in the discussions. Among them was Peter Sugar, who gave a fascinating account of the overseas literature on Hungarian history.

Since the year 1967 also marked the centennial of the Austro-Hungarian compromise and because our own conference was to be followed by an international congress at Bratislava, the program of the Budapest meeting was rounded off with discussions dealing with present problems which the Compromise had brought in its train. At one of these sessions,

which was attended largely by foreign participants and by specialists in this particular field, György Szabad presented the views of Hungarian historians on these issues. His discussion was followed by an animated debate during the course of which many opposing points of view were expressed.

*Historical Institute of the
Hungarian Academy of Sciences*

ZSUZSA L. NAGY

*Austro-Hungarian Symposium on the
Compromise of 1867*

Two meetings organized by Austrian and Hungarian historians provided an excellent forum for discussing the many-sided problems of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The first, which was devoted to the theme "The Compromise and the Genesis of the Dualistic State," was held at Graz on October 5-7, 1967. The internal problems of and the symptoms of disintegration in the dualistic state were analyzed at a second meeting at the Hungarian city of Pécs on May 23-25, 1968. At both meetings a serious effort was made to get at the roots of the matter by approaching the subject from the three different angles of economic, political, and cultural history and by having papers presented on each particular theme by both an Austrian and a Hungarian historian. Sometimes these parallel lectures merely supplemented each other; in other instances, they presented different materials or points of view. In either case, they were followed by more or less lengthy debates of an informative nature.

In a lecture rich with important historical information, Ferdinand Tremel discussed the economic antecedents of and the bases of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. Pointing out the economic superiority of Austria over agrarian Hungary, he described economic developments in the empire after the middle of the eighteenth century. Subjecting the results of the revolution of 1848 to a thorough analysis, he maintained that they were conducive to modern capitalistic development. The economic boom, the expansion of capital, the increased traffic in goods, and the improvement of railways everywhere in Europe after the revolution brought the halves of the monarchy closer to each other economically. Tremel emphasized the fact that the two parts of the empire were dependent on each other—a circumstance that did not escape the attention

of the ruling classes at that time. Nevertheless, as early as 1867 Austria and Hungary had conflicting economic interests, which increased in extent and intensity during the decades which followed. In his lecture at Pécs, Tremel gave a survey of economic developments in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. He pointed out, in a convincing way, that during this period Hungary developed at a somewhat more rapid pace than Austria. He made a thorough analysis of the political-economic problems of the empire and touched upon the important questions of finance, the budget, foreign trade, and tariff policies. He concluded that economic factors played no significant role in the disintegration of the monarchy.

Alexander Novotny analyzed the internal political situation in the monarchy at the time the Compromise was signed. Even though the Austrian Liberals, after numerous efforts and failures, were also favorably inclined towards making an agreement with Hungary, he regarded the Compromise primarily as a victory for the Hungarian Liberals. Novotny's subtle description of Francis Joseph's personal role in the Compromise and the changes in his points of view in regard to it constituted a highly interesting part of his lecture. In a brief talk at Pécs, Novotny succeeded in giving an impressive description of the political problems of the half-century dualistic system. He described the procedures followed in establishing the dualistic state, discussed the changes made in diplomatic policy, analyzed Gyula Andrassy's role, explained the internal contradictions of dualism, and analyzed the reform plans aimed at altering it. A considerable part of the lecture was devoted to a discussion of the separatist federalist tendencies which were constantly hovering behind the existing dualist system and to an analysis of the political role played by and the feeling of hopelessness which finally resulted from it.

Anton Klein evaluated Austria's cultural heritage. He emphasized the imposing progress in several areas after the *Ausgleich* and especially stressed Vienna's role as a cultural center. In his lecture at Pécs, he treated in detail the cultural assets of the individual nationalities and the cultural exchanges between them. He devoted much attention to the cultural policies which affected the various nationalities and pointed out their significant results. He also criticized the detrimental, repressive features of the cultural policies of various individual nationalities, especially the Hungarians.

In examining the economic provisions of the Compromise, György Ránki raised questions about the most important problems relating to the economic development of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Especially interesting was his analysis of the economic relations between Austria and Hungary, namely, of the often-disputed question of whether Hungary's economic connections with the monarchy were advantageous or disadvantageous to her. Agreeing with the Hungarian historians who supported the thesis that these ties were beneficial, Ránki answered the question by stressing the advantages. With convincing statistics, he demonstrated that during the last third of the nineteenth century the indispensable element of the industrial development of Hungary, capital (and in part also labor), came from outside the country.

Lajos Ruzsás, an expert on the economic history of the Trans-Danubian region, presented his listeners with a picture of the process of capitalistic development in small-scale farming in a paper entitled "The Effects of the Expansion of Trade on Trans-Danubian Peasant Economy before 1918." His article was based on important primary sources.

In his discussion of the political background of the Compromise, István Diószegi traced the Hungarian national movement up to the time of the *Ausgleich*. He stated that the Magyars based their demands for autonomy within the empire, their insistence that the lands of the Holy Empire of St. Stephen must be left intact, and their claims for the supremacy of the Magyars in the historic Kingdom of Hungary on the special individualistic nature of political nationalism. He pointed out that Hungarian nationalism could honor the alternatives of autonomy and independence only within the framework of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. At the same time, Magyarism adhered without reservation to the concept of the integrity and supremacy of the Magyar nation. Diószegi maintained that the original program of the Hungarian national movement was realized in the Compromise.

In a paper on the aims of the monarchy in World War I, József Galántai touched upon the aspirations of the Hungarian government during the period between 1914 and 1918, thereby putting the far off political consequences of the Compromise into perspective. After giving a detailed account of the changes in war aims made for strategic reasons, he spoke about the occasions when István Tisza and István Burián always

placed specific Hungarian interests in the forefront.

Lászlo Mátrai, a well-known historian of philosophy, gave two lectures dealing with the cultural problems of the *Ausgleich*. Both of them served to illustrate how phenomena in the economy, society, politics, and culture that are seemingly unrelated can and must logically be knit into a single thread and assigned a corresponding order of values. In a positive sense, Mátrai showed that successful research in cultural history is wholly dependent on the surmounting of independent category systems of this branch of knowledge. In his two lectures Mátrai also demonstrated that a well-founded knowledge of philosophy in no ways runs into conflict with a historical approach. We can illustrate this with the following citation from his text: "As an economic and political base, the monarchy fell in 1918. Nonetheless, the cultural superstructure which, in spite of differences in national cultures, was to a certain extent characteristic of the way of thinking of the peoples living here, did not simultaneously cease to exist."

The conference of Austrian and Hungarian historians on the centennial of the Compromise provided a fine example of scholarly cooperation. Both groups believe that the excellent work initiated by the above conferences will be followed by further cooperative efforts.

*Eötvös Loránd
University of Budapest*

ISTVÁN DIÓSZEGI